EMERGENCY IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

MADILYN SHORT, RILEY VON BORSTEL, KJRSTEN SCHINDLER. JAY-MARK and PASCUA.

Appellants,

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

GOVERNOR MICHAEL J. DUNLEAVY in his official capacity, THE STATE OF ALASKA, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, and THE STATE OF ALASKA, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

Appellees.

Case No.: S-18333

Trial Court No.: 3AN-22-04028CI

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER DENYING EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE BRIEFING SCHEDULE

Appellants Madilyn Short, Riley von Borstel, Kjrsten Schindler, and Jay-Mark Pascua (collective the "Student Appellants") respectfully request reconsideration of the Order dated February 25, 2022, which denied the Student Appellants' emergency motion to expedite, pursuant to Alaska Appellate Rule 503(h)(1)(B).

The Student Appellants renew their request for a decision on the merits of this appeal by no later than May 4, 2022, a request that is *not* opposed by Appellees and is supported by a separate filing of the Alaska Legislative Council. Because this appeal concerns the location and accessibility of over \$422 million, which necessarily has an impact on this year's legislative session, the FY2023 budget, and the legislature's appropriation power, this Court should GRANT the Student Appellants' request and

ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION OF MOTION FOR EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE BRIEFING SCHEDULE Short, et al. v. Dunleavy, et al., Case No. S-18333

Page 1 of 5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

expedite this appeal's briefing schedule. A decision on this emergency motion is requested by the close of business on March 7, 2022.

As explained in the Student Appellants' emergency motion to expedite, this appeal concerns whether the Alaska Higher Education Investment Fund ("HEIF") must be "swept" into the Constitution Budget Reserve ("CBR") pursuant to article IX, section 17(d) of the Alaska Constitution. Because the superior court determined that the HEIF is subject to the annual CBR "sweep," over \$422 million is now no longer accessible by the legislature through a simple majority vote, and can instead only be accessed by a three-fourths vote of both houses of the legislature.² Furthermore, the \$422 million that had previously been invested will likely be liquidated, and the State will consequently see much lower rates of return, and potentially suffer financial losses resulting from the liquidation.³ Accordingly, even if the legislature attempted to remedy this issue by amending the HEIF statute, it will likely be unable to recapitalize the Fund absent clarity from this Court. This appeal is therefore not just about funding this year's

See AS 37.14.750.

See Alaska Const. art. IX, § 17(c).

Compare HEIF, Net Asset Value, As of the Month Ending December 31, 2021 (valuing the HEIF at \$422.8 million as of December 31, 2021), and HEIF, Net Asset Value, As of the Month Ending November 30, 2021 (valuing the HEIF at \$410.5 million as of November 30, 2021), with Treasury Division, Accounting Section, General Fund and Other Non-Segregated Investments (GeFONSI) (Jan. 20, 2022) (showing an annualized rate of return for the CBR of approximately 0.04% for the same timeframe).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

scholarship, grant, and loan programs for students pursuing postsecondary educational opportunities in Alaska.

As required by Appellate Rule 504(c) for emergency motions, the telephone numbers and addresses of counsel are as follows:

Counsel for Appellants:

Jahna M. Lindemuth Scott M. Kendall Samuel G. Gottstein Cashion Gilmore & Lindemuth 510 L Street, Suite 601 Anchorage, AK 99501 (907) 222-7932

Counsel for Appellees:

Margaret Paton Walsh Kate Demarest Alaska Department of Law 1031 West 4th Avenue, Suite 200 Anchorage, AK 99501 (907) 269-5275

The Student Appellants also note that opposing counsel, in response to a request made on February 27, 2022, reiterated via email today that they do not oppose expedited consideration, and that the Governor's office actually favors expedited consideration. Appellees' only request is that Appellees not be required to begin drafting its brief until after March 14, 2022. This scheduling request can easily be met by any expedited briefing schedule by making Appellants' brief due on or after March 14.

25

ORDER DENYING EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE BRIEFING SCHEDULE

Short, et al. v. Dunleavy, et al., Case No. S-18333

(907) 222-7932 fax (907) 222-7938

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Additionally, the Alaska Legislative Council, representing the legislative branch, plans to separately file a joinder to the Student Appellants' emergency motion for reconsideration. The Legislative Council refrained from intervening in the superior court proceeding because it wanted a quick decision in this case and on appeal. Knowing where the HEIF monies are located is required so that the legislature can take effective action regarding those monies this session.

The parties disagree on the correct interpretation of article IX, section 17(d), but are in total agreement that this is a case of statewide importance justifying expedited consideration. In fact, this Court has agreed in the past; the two prior times this Court has had to interpret other sections of article IX, section 17, the Court considered those cases on an expedited basis.⁴ This Court should not depart from its standard practice of expediting such appeals, especially when it concerns hundreds of millions of dollars, how those funds can be accessed by the current legislature, and whether the legislature retains the power to appropriate such monies.

The Student Appellants respectfully request that this Court reconsider its Order dated February 25 and GRANT Appellants' unopposed request to expedite this appeal so that the parties may have a decision by no later than May 4, 2022.

See Hickel v. Halford, 872 P.2d 171, 174 (Alaska 1994) (deciding, on an expedited basis, the interpretation of article IX, section 17(a)); Hickel v. Cowper, 874 P.2d 922, 925 (Alaska 1994) (deciding, on an expedited basis, the interpretation of article IX, section 17(b)).

CASHION GILMORE & LINDEMUTH Attorneys for Appellants

DATE: 2-23-2022

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Jahna M. Lindemuth Alaska Bar No. 9711068 Scott M. Kendall Alaska Bar No. 0405019 Samuel G. Gottstein Alaska Bar No. 1511099

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served via email on February 28, 2022 on the following:

Margaret Paton-Walsh margaret.paton-walsh@alaska.gov

Katherine Demarest kate.demarest@alaska.gov

James E. Torgerson jim.torgerson@stoel.com

Kevin Cuddy kevin.cuddy@stoel.com

Connor R. Smith connor.smith@stoel.com

CASHION GILMORE & LINDEMUTH

By: <u>s/Colleen McGovern</u> Colleen McGovern

22

23

24

25

26

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER DENYING EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE BRIEFING SCHEDULE

Short, et al. v. Dunleavy, et al., Case No. S-18333